UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,550	03/08/2007	Hisae Kume	SPO.129	4478
	7590 11/09/201 K LLOYD & SALIW	EXAMINER		
A PROFESSION PO Box 142950	NAL ASSOCIATION	DUBOIS, PHILIP A		
GAINESVILLE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1781	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

euspto@slspatents.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/593,550	KUME ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	PHILIP DUBOIS	1781	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires _months from the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	w);		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-11. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. \square Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
	/Lien T Tran/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1789	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The arguments concerning the declaration have not been considered as the declaration has not been entered. The Declaration of Dr. Kisae Kume under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 has not been entered because it raises new issues that require a further search and/or consideration of the application. In this regard, it is noted that the Amendment of November 1, 2010 does not provide a showing or sufficient reasons as to why this evidence was not submitted earlier. The changes to claim 6 also raises new issues that require a further search and/or consideration of the application. The scope of claim 6 has been changed in that previous claim 6 requires a combination of any of a-c. Claim 6 now recites a MarKush group, which is different in scope because the markush group only requires one out of the group and not the combination.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to the arguments relating to IZVEKOVA, the rejection is maintained for the reasons set forth in the Final Rejection of September 3, 2010. Furthermore, the arguments relating to the declaration has not been considered for the reasons noted above.